



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,562	12/30/2003	Gregory P. Crawford	59067US002	8039

32692 7590 12/14/2005

3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY  
PO BOX 33427  
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427

EXAMINER
----------

CHEN, WEN YING PATTY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

Applicant's Amendment filed Sept. 26, 2005 has been received and entered. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 10-26, 31, 34, 38 and 41 remain pending in the current application.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 18-20, 31 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kuo et al. (US 6292244).

With respect to claim 1: Kuo et al. disclose in Figure 6 a method, comprising:  
exposing an alignment material (element 612) to an interference pattern to cause a chemical reaction in the alignment material; and  
exposing the alignment material to a liquid crystal,  
wherein the liquid crystal aligns relative to the alignment material based on the interference pattern (Column 4, lines 28-56).

As to claims 18-20: Kuo et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 28-46 that the alignment material comprises a polymer, which can be of a cinnamate group (PVC) or made of polyimide.

Art Unit: 2871

As to claims 31 and 34: Kuo et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 28-57 that the interference pattern comprises regions of different polarization and the liquid crystal aligns relative to the alignment material based on the polarization of the interference pattern.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 11-12, 16-18, 22-23, 25-26 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Seiberle et al. (US 6876417).

With respect to claim 1: Seiberle et al. disclose in Figure 5 a method, comprising:  
exposing an alignment material (element 2) to an interference pattern to cause a chemical reaction in the alignment material; and  
exposing the alignment material to a liquid crystal,  
wherein the liquid crystal aligns relative to the alignment material based on the interference pattern (Column 2, lines 25-32).

As to claim 2: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 11-14 that the chemical reaction causes polymerization in the alignment material.

As to claim 4: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 11-14 that the chemical reaction comprises a photochemical reaction.

As to claim 5: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Figure 5 that a surface of the alignment material (element 2) is exposed to the interference pattern.

As to claims 11 and 12: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 3 lines 46-47 that the alignment material is disposed on a surface of a substrate comprising a substrate material made of at least one of a glass, a polymer, a metal and semi-conductor.

As to claim 16: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 25-44 that the liquid crystal permeates the alignment material.

As to claim 17: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 25-44 that the alignment material comprises a liquid crystal.

As to claim 18: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 4 lines 11-14 that the alignment material comprises a polymer.

As to claim 22: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Figure 5 that the interference pattern is formed from two or more optical beams which originate from the same source.

As to claim 23: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Column 2 line 55 that the optical beams comprise UV radiation.

As to claims 25 and 26: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Figure 5 and Column 2 lines 26-33 that the interference pattern comprises regions of high intensity and regions of low intensity and that the liquid crystal aligns relative to the alignment material based on the intensity of the interference pattern.

As to claim 38: Seiberle et al. further disclose in Figure 5 that the interference pattern is formed by overlapping two or more beams.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 10, 13-15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seiberle et al. (US 6876417) in view of Yamada et al. (US 6067141).

With respect to claim 10: Seiberle et al. disclose all of the limitations set forth in the previous claims, but fail to disclose that the surface of the alignment material comprises a channel.

However, Yamada et al. disclose in Figure 3A an alignment layer (element 52), which comprises a channel.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an alignment layer comprising of a channel as taught by Yamada et al. when patterning the alignment layer using the method as taught by Seiberle et al., since Yamada et al. teach that the channels form multiple domains in the display region, wherein the liquid crystals can thus have randomized alignment directions and thus provide a liquid crystal display device which has an excellent all-direction viewing angle characteristic (Column 13, lines 53-59, Column 9, lines 4-7).

As to claims 13-15: Seiberle et al. disclose all of the limitations set forth in the previous claims, but fail to specifically disclose the substrate configuration.

However, Yamada et al. disclose that the substrate comprises a transparent electrode layer (Column 10, lines 25-26) and a thin film transistor (Column 12, lines 15-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form an alignment layer for orienting the liquid crystal using the method taught by Seiberle et al. on an array substrate configured according to Yamada et al. so that an active matrix display type can be obtained in order to supply voltage to the liquid crystal layer, as taught by Yamada et al. (Column 16, lines 62-66).

Art Unit: 2871

As to claim 21: Seiberle et al. disclose all of the limitations set forth in the previous claims, but fail to disclose that the alignment material comprises of silane.

However, Yamada et al. teach the use of silane on the alignment layer (Column 12, lines 7-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use silane on the alignment layer as taught by Yamada et al. and pattern the alignment layer with the method taught by Seiberle et al., since Yamada et al. teach that silane treatment of the alignment layer helps in fixating the alignment layer on the substrate (Column 12, lines 7-14).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seiberle et al. (US 6876417) in view of Hirata et al. (US 5652634).

Seiberle et al. disclose all of the limitations set forth in claim 1, but fail to disclose that the interference pattern is formed from two or more electron beams.

However, Hirata et al. teach the use of electron beams for patterning an alignment layer (Column 25, lines 30-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pattern the alignment material with the method as taught by Seiberle et al. by using the electron beams for patterning as taught by Hirata et al., since Hirata et al. teach that electron beams are used to easily obtain high energy sufficient enough to change the orientation direction of the liquid crystal molecules (Column 25, lines 21-36).



Art Unit: 2871

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seiberle et al. (US 6876417) in view of Kelsey et al. (US 2002/0169849).

Seiberle et al. disclose all of the limitations set forth in claim 1, but fail to disclose that the interference pattern is formed by overlapping three or more beams and at least two of the beam have similar polarization states.

However, Kelsey et al. disclose in Figure 6b the use of three laser light beams having at least two beams with similar polarization states, generated from the same laser source in forming the interference pattern.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to pattern the alignment material as taught by Seiberle et al. using the light beam source configuration as taught by Kelsey et al., since the overlapping regions of the different light beams generate specific periodic structures on the surfaces, as taught by Kelsey et al. (Paragraph 0054).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, filed Sept. 26, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2, 4-5, 10-26, 31, 34, 38 and 41 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the new found references in the rejections as set forth in the Office Action above.

***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Ying P. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-8444. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on (571)272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Ying P Chen  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2871

WPC  
12/09/05

  
ANDREW SCHECHTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER